

REMARKS

Claims 7-17, 19, and 20 have been canceled. Claims 1, 3, 4, 5, 18, and 21 have been amended to clarify the subject matter regarded as the invention. Claims 1-6, 18, and 21 remain pending.

Claims 1-6, 18, and 21 are rejected under 35 § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Banavar et al. (U.S. 6,336,119) in view of Calvert et al., entitled "Core Selection Methods for Multicast Routing". Claims 1-6, 18, and 21 are rejected under 35 § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Banavar et al. (U.S. 6,336,119) in view of Chen et al. (U.S. 5,831,975).

The rejection is respectfully traversed. With respect to claim 1, Banavar teaches a publish-subscribe system. The Examiner states on page 2 of the Office Action that "this configuration, i.e. topology, is static unless network changes occur." Calvert teaches various methods of selecting a core node. Chen teaches maintaining multiple core nodes in ATM networks. Chen describes how "once selected, it is assumed that core nodes will not change." (column 8, line 40).

Banavar, Calvert, and Chen do not teach, either singly or in combination, "receiving new performance information associated with [a] new client; determining based at least in part on the new performance information whether the new client should be used instead of the first primary client to forward multicast information to the secondary client; and in the event it is determined that the new client should be used instead of the first primary client to forward multicast information to the secondary client, designating the new client as a new primary client to be used to forward information a subsequently sent portion of the information, if any, to the secondary client," as recited in amended claim 1. Support for the amendment to claim 1 may be found, without limitation, in the above-captioned application at page 15, lines 2-4 and at pages 19, line 17 to page 24, line 21. As such, claim 1 is believed to be allowable.

Claims 2 – 4 depend from claim 1 and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Similarly to claim 1, claim 5 recites "in the event a new client is added to the set of clients: receiving new performance information associated with the new client; and determining

based at least in part on the new performance information whether the new client should be a primary client.” As such, claim 18 is believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Like claim 5, claim 6 recites “in the event a new client is added to the set of clients: receiving new performance information associated with the new client; and determining based at least in part on the new performance information whether the new client should be a primary client.” As such, claim 6 is believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Similarly to claim 1, claim 18 recites a server comprising logic configured to “in the event a new client is added to the set of clients, update the primary client determination based at least in part on a new performance information associated with the new client.” As such, claim 18 is believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Like claim 1, claim 21 recites “receiving new performance information associated with [a] new client; determining based at least in part on the new performance information whether the new client should be used instead of the first primary client to forward multicast information to the secondary client; and in the event it is determined that the new client should be used instead of the first primary client to forward multicast information to the secondary client, designating the new client as a new primary client to be used to forward information a subsequently sent portion of the information, if any, to the secondary client.” As such, claim 21 is believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Reconsideration of the application and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested based on the preceding remarks. If at any time the Examiner believes that an interview would be helpful, please contact the undersigned.

Dated: 5/4/05

Respectfully submitted,



William J. James
Registration No. 40,661
V 408-973-2592
F 408-973-2595

VAN PELT, YI & JAMES LLP
10050 N. Foothill Blvd., Suite 200
Cupertino, CA 95014